UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

To Avert World Disaster

By Salmon O. Levinson

The Authority for Law (*An Editorial*) - - - - - *Arthur L. Weatherly*

Chaplaincies for the Dead - *Robert Whitaker*

Recovery for the United States - - - - - - - - *Millard E. Tydings*

The "Farley Bill"—A Menace - *Stella Hanau*

VOLUME CXV NUMBER 6

Chicago, May 20, 1935

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter November 15, 1933, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 103
The Authority for Law—ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY 106
Jottings—J. H. H 108
ARTICLES—
Chaplaincies for the Dead—ROBERT WHITAKER 108
To Avert World Disaster—SALMON O. LEVINSON 110
Recovery for the United States—MILLARD E. TYDINGS 112
The "Farley" Bill—a Menace—STELLA HANAU 115
POETRY—
Selected—*Wordsworth* 103
Flower Market—RALPH CHEYNEY 111
National Patterns—MARY CHANNELL STEVENS 111
Attainment—ELLA BAXTER WINN 116
Prayer from a Texas Hilltop—RALPH CHEYNEY 120
THE STUDY TABLE—
Cromwell's Conquests—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 117
CORRESPONDENCE—
Billions in Tribute to the Money Changers—S. O. SANDERSON .. 118
Poetry in America—LLOYD FRANK MERRELL 118
Why Pick on Mexico?—C. G. M 118
The Academy of American Poets—MARIE BULLOCK 118
Anti-War Broadcast—BERT H. DAVIS 119
Thanks, Dear Friend!—J. T. R. 119
THE FIELD—
Honoring the Heroes of Peace—Peace Heroes Memorial Society 102
Birth Control Bill Supported by W. I. L. 119
Elihu Burritt—SYDNEY STRONG 119
Mencken's Mercury—*W. J. Lhamon* 120

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Honoring the Heroes of Peace

Services of Remembrance for Heroes of Social Construction constitute a mode of honoring the dead whose claims to honor have long been overlooked.

Miners, railroaders, builders, electricians, mechanics, firemen, policemen, explorers, physicians, nurses, mothers and others upon whose risks and sufferings life depends, form an army larger than any fighting force of which history has record. It is an army serving without intermission and knowing no armistice, an army that endures both pain and privation. It numbers its losses of life by the tens of thousands every year and its other casualties by the hundreds of thousands. It goes to its hard perilous battles without decorations and without honors; it does not wait for

"the roll of the stirring drum
And the trumpet that speaks of fame."

Yet it is the army of our real national defence, our defence against hunger, cold, sickness, exposure, disorder, exhaustion, extinction; ultimately perhaps our true defence against foreign foes. Enabling us to supply all the world with things of necessity, comfort and beauty, the army of social construction makes the rest of the world unwilling to be our foes.

The miner perishes in an explosion. The railroader dies in a collision. The builder is mangled to death falling from his scaffold. The fireman is crushed beneath the collapsing wall. The policeman is shot down defending the law. The physician and the nurse succumb to the disease which they are investigating or combating. No less does maternity exact much agony and precious life as the price of life.

Shall not we who honor the army that slays, all the more honor the army that heals and preserves? We acclaim the heroism of the fighter. Shall we not acclaim the more beneficent heroism of the worker, the investigator, the mother?

To this end the Peace Heroes Memorial Society founded in 1926 has been continuing the annual Services of Remembrance for Heroes of Social Construction begun May 30th, 1923. These services are held at Spring Grove Cemetery, Cincinnati, O., on the morning of

(*Continued on Page* 119)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXV MONDAY, MAY 20, 1935 No. 6

One adequate support
For the calamities of mortal life
Exists—one only; an assured belief
That the procession of our fate, howe'er
Sad or disturbed, is ordered by a Being
Of infinite benevolence and power;
Whose everlasting purposes embrace
All accidents, converting them to good.
—The darts of anguish fix not where the seat
Of suffering hath been thoroughly fortified
By acquiescence in the Will supreme
For time and for eternity; by faith,
Faith absolute in God, including hope,
And the defence that lies in boundless love
Of his perfections; with habitual dread
Of aught unworthily conceived, endured
Impatiently, ill-done, or left undone,
To the dishonor of his holy name.
Soul of our souls, and safeguard of the world!
Sustain, thou only canst, the sick of heart;
Restore their languid spirits, and recall
Their lost affections unto thee and thine!

—Wordsworth.

Has the World progressed? Well, we are inclined to think it has when we look at the English Jubilee, and recall that George V is the successor on the throne of Henry VIII, or, for that matter, of George IV. The world has at least progressed far enough to get rid of most kings, and to make such an exemplary monarch as the present British sovereign alone possible. We recognize, of course, that this Jubilee is simply a business affair. The King is once again amiably consenting to drum up trade. The celebration is held just like a fair, or an exposition—for the money there is in it! But we recognize, also, that behind the commercial features there is a real excuse, or rather reason, for national rejoicing over the twenty-fifth anniversary of George V, for in this ruler, it seems to us, we have the perfect example of the democratic king. In this troublous age, this royal personage has displayed and justified the English government as without question the safest, justest, and freest in the world. After the unspeakable Georges of the 18th and early 19th centuries and the temporary William IV, there came Victoria whose memorable age was marred by her snobbishness, stuffiness, and general stogyness. Then came her son, Edward, who was disreputable in his private life, and who persistently interfered in governmental policies to the great damage of world peace. Then, a quarter of a century ago, came the present George, whose tragic and terrible age has shown him only more and more the model modern monarch. His very commonplaceness as an individual has been the basis of his greatness as an English king. Impeccable in personal character, unimpeachable in public duty, simple, hardworking, prudent, wise, he stands, as he has stood for years, as the perfect embodiment of all that is strong and therefore enduring in English government and society. This ruler has adapted himself flawlessly to the exigencies of his task and of his hour, and thus with good reason has held firm his throne while other kings, like so many nine-pins, have been scattered by the driving impact of war and revolution. If there is a Britain that we hate, there is an England that we love, and in domestic virtue, personal character, and public leadership, George V is that England.

Military appropriations mount—and *mount!* The Army Bill, already signed by the President, calls for the expenditure of $402,000,000 to modernize the army—this in addition to a total of more than $300,000,000 for regular budgetary maintenance! The Bill includes an appropriation of $90,000,000 for 800 new armored airplanes to be added to our present total of 1520, making a grand total of 2320, the largest air force in the world, unless Germany has secretly built a greater number of 'planes. The army personnel has been increased from 118,000 to 165,000 men, with 200,000 as the planned maximum. As a mere incidental item 113 new R. O. T. C. camps have been authorized, with the idea of doubling the present number of reserve officers. With this measure out of the way, the House of Representatives received a Navy Bill calling for expenditures of $457,786,261, and after cursory consideration passed a bill raising the total expenditures to $457,805,261. Always up a little, instead of down a lot! This appropriation, which will probably be raised by the Senate, compares with an appropriation of $310,564,749 in 1934—an increase of nearly $150,000,000. Thus a Congress which a generation ago shocked the world as "a billion dollar Congress," has now become a *billion dollar Congress for armaments alone.* And note, please, that the famous "billion dollar Congress" appropriated a billion dollars in *two years* for all national expenses, whereas this Congress is appropriating more than a billion dollars in *one year* for military expenses only! And all this at the request, or rather under the orders, of President Roosevelt, who

approved in the White House estimated expenditures for army and navy in 1935 of $1,021,964,908—a figure already now increased by Congressional action. Yet these are peace times, and the President has pledged himself to "a good neighbor" policy in his relations with other countries! We wish that there were fewer words and more deeds. Knowing the story of preparedness as we do, it is our reluctant conviction, as we see this feverish arming on land and sea, that if Mr. Roosevelt were a militarist and war-monger of the Mussolini type, he could not be doing more or worse than he is doing today to foment war.

The huge preparedness appropriations, the establishment of new naval and air bases in the Pacific, the constant flying westward under pretext of developing commercial airways to Hawaii, above all the naval maneuvers off the Aleutian Islands, are all having alarming effect upon Japanese public opinion. Sherwood Eddy was in Japan in the late winter and reports that he "found an inflamed state of public opinion. One could no more argue with many Japanese at this time than with a fever patient with a temperature of 105 degrees." That this fever has not gone down any in recent weeks is shown by a formidable article recently published in the *Nichi Nichi,* Japan's leading newspaper. The fleet maneuvers and the naval air policy in the Pacific, says the *Nichi Nichi,* show that "the American Navy is doing all it can to maintain world supremacy." The paper then goes on to say that the maneuvers are nothing in the world but training for crossing the Pacific. The fleet is just rehearsing a plan, that's all, for the capture of Japan's South Sea Islands. The establishment of a trans-Pacific commercial airway is simply a cover for aggressive military designs against the Far East, while the construction of new planes and the increase in the number of naval officers reveal preparations for a Far Eastern campaign. All of which may be wild talk! But it is just the sort of talk that is bound to break loose under such provocation—*and the Japanese believe it!* Now let something happen this summer—one of these famous "incidents"! Let a ship be sunk in the maneuvers, as the great dirigible was sunk off the California coast some months ago, or as the "Maine" was sunk years ago in the harbor of Havana, and *we* will believe these wild imaginings. And then, through fear on both sides, each fanned like flame by the other, the war will be here. That's the way wars come! We believe that now is the time for friendly action. If we were President, we would seek the immediate repeal of the Japanese Exclusion Act, call off the maneuvers and donate the money saved to the earthquake sufferers in Formosa, and call Japan into instant conference to ends of peace and goodwill.

Father Coughlin has realized his ambition. He has become a national figure, and a factor in the next presidential election of first-class importance. Already Huey Long has begun angling for the support of the radio priest and his National Union for Social Justice. President Roosevelt will in due course, and by less direct and open ways, do the same. Which one of these two men secures the coveted prize, with its more than eight million enrolled members—an enormous voting strength—may well determine the outcome of the 1936 campaign. If so, Father Coughlin would be a president-maker, and thus to a great extent a dictator of national policies. It is obvious that, in his present swing around the circle, he is playing for high stakes! With attacks upon Father Coughlin for his discussion of political questions and his entrance upon political activities as inconsistent with his character as a priest of the church and a minister of religion, we have not the slightest sympathy. On the contrary, we insist that the Father has done us all inestimable service in identifying religion and politics. He is right in pointing the social significance of the Gospel, and right again in claiming the support of the Popes whose encyclicals on labor and kindred themes have been enlightened and progressive. None the less, we deplore Father Coughlin's influence and would condemn his leadership. Not the priest but the man is what we fear. Charles E. Coughlin simply does not qualify in knowledge, intelligence, or character for the great work that he would do. His speeches reveal an ignorance of political and economic questions which is appalling. Not once, in all his millions of words, has he ever shown that he has read, much less studied, a single standard work of political economy. In this whole vast field, he is an absolute illiterate. But not only is his knowledge nil, his intelligence is scant. His discussion of current questions shows a mind as superficial as it is uninformed. The platform of his National Union, for example, is a mere haphazard collection of helter-skelter odds and ends, picked up from the platitudes of all the radical debates of the last fifty or more years. It is not that this platform has not some good planks in it. It is rather that these planks, good and bad, are built into no ordered system of reform, have no constructive relationship with one another, and reveal no intelligent grasp of realities. Father Coughlin, like the late Mr. Bryan, talks well, but has no brains. Most serious of all, the radio priest is devoid of character. He is unscrupulous in his methods, insensitive to moral principles and ideals. His support of Mayor Walker, of New York, his investments in silver futures, his villainous and dirty attacks on birth control, his ignorant and slanderous assaults on Mr. Baruch, these and other like incidents reveal a man who will stoop to anything to gain his ends. Father Coughlin is the perfect type of demagogue. His leadership of millions of Americans is a public menace of formidable proportions.

I have said that the United States cannot be considered a "nation at all" as the word is commonly employed: it is alto-

gether too vast in area, its population too mixed in race and color. its huge commonwealths and legislatures too diverse in interests, climates and "sovereign" rights. Political sagacity has always been wanting here; and even the early fathers—Washington, Adams, Franklin, Madison and Monroe—deplored this fact and sought to remedy it. The first President thought the political enlightenment of his people a matter of "primary importance"; Lincoln called it the most pressing of all civic duties. But just as America entered the World War quite helpless as a belligerent, so is she unable to adjust herself to today's universal crisis in the economic sphere. "Public opinion" is many and various; tenets of policy common to all are very hard to establish in a land of continental range.

This paragraph is from an article by William George Fitz-Gerald in the *Nineteenth Century* (London). We quote it here because it is so profoundly true, and so important to any understanding of this country. For it is impossible to comprehend the whys and wherefores of what goes on in America unless one remembers always this truth that we are not a nation but a continent. Alabama is no more of a piece with Massachusetts than Italy is with Finland. The prairies of the West are as far sundered from the industrial centers of the East as the steppes of Russia from the streets of Birmingham and Sheffield. The Pacific coast is as surely in another world from that known to the Atlantic as the Mediterranean from the Baltic. It is this fact, with its myriad illustrations, which accounts for much of the chaos and confusion of our American life. Suppose Europe were suddenly thrown into one great "nation," would there not immediately appear in that "nation" the divided counsels, the contending outlooks, even the lawlessness and crime now so lamentably characteristic of this union of forty-eight sovereign states? But there is another side to this picture. The continental character of this Republic is not only chaotic but constructive. It is the one sure pledge and promise that we have of the ultimate feasibility and therefore ultimate triumph of internationalism. In the beginning of our nation's history, thirteen independent colonies (or nations) joined themselves together into "a common union," an international society. This original union of seaboard settlements has now expanded to a continent, tropical and arctic, agricultural and industrial, with a population gathered from all sections of the globe, representing all races, religions, and tongues. If these peoples can hold together, why cannot all peoples do the same? The United States of America has its proudest mission as a prophecy of the United States of the World.

Recent events in Germany must have convinced the last reluctant doubter that Hitler is resolved to bring the churches to heel, and thus break opposition at any cost of persecution and terror. Never was the situation more ominous. Just before Easter 700 Protestant pastors were temporarily arrested and thus snatched from their flocks at the high tide of the ecclesiastical year. Many pastors and priests are now in jail or in concentration camps, and the numbers are steadily increasing. Other pastors and priests and church executives and superintendents are being exiled by secret orders of the police from their parishes, districts, and offices, and thus rendered totally ineffective. In Berlin, last month, 11 pastors were ordered to leave their parishes for "disturbing the peace," and the same thing was done in Silesia, where the number of pastors thus affected is unknown. In Mecklenburg the Nazis have undertaken to bankrupt the clergy by laying on them fines varying from 300 to 1,000 marks, sums calculated to ruin and break the spirit of the pastors of the villages and market towns. In Saxony, according to a wireless dispatch in the New York *Times,* the Nazi bishop has called upon the police to expel so many ministers from their churches that half the churches in the diocese are without pastoral care. Most serious are the recent ordinances forbidding all Protestant and Catholic public rallies. Most sensational was the huge Nordic pagan rally held in the Berlin Sportpalast, with tens of thousands of Nazi devotees in attendance. What seems to be happening is a deliberate move to crush the free spirit of Christianity, and at the same time to create in its place a recrudescent Nordic faith of the old barbaric type. It must be confessed that such faith of Thor and Wotan fits the Nazi movement as well as the religion of Jesus fits it ill. Meanwhile, the hard-pressed Christians are talking of taking their worship underground. With the Jews of Germany reestablishing their ghettoes and the Christians their catacombs, who can deny that the Dark Ages are with us once again?

Mr. H. G. Wells, playing a favorite game of his, has named the three greatest men of history. Some years ago he named six, but three of his former six, he now says, "seem to have lost emphasis." The fact is, he continues, "there are not Six Greatest names to be cited. . . There are more or fewer. There are many—or there are only three." The first of this three, according to Mr. Wells, is JESUS. Confessing himself as not a Christian, he yet names the Nazarene as the "single individual (who) has left the most permanent impression on the world." A man must be judged, he says, by the question, What did he leave to grow! "By this test, Jesus stands first." Next, Mr. Wells names BUDDHA, who did for the eastern world much of what Jesus did for the western world. "He, too, gave a message to mankind universal in its character." For his third name Mr. Wells writes ARISTOTLE, "who is as cardinal in the story of the human intelligence as Christ and Buddha in the story of the human will." Aristotle began a new thing in the world—"the classifying and analyzing of information." He was thus the father of ordered thinking, the true forerunner of all that we mean by science. In thinking of other names, Mr. Wells ponders Plato, Mahomet, Confucius, Robert Owen, "the real founder of modern Socialism," Karl Marx, Roger Bacon, and, sole among Americans, Abraham Lincoln. But none of them measures up to

the first three. It is to be noted that Mr. Wells's names are all drawn from the realm of the intellect and the spirit—his first two men are religious leaders, and his third the greatest thinker of all time. No soldiers appear at all, no statesmen (except Lincoln, whom Wells hails as a man rather than a political leader), not even any churchmen. It is obviously within and not without that the immortal things are done. Nations rise and fall, civilizations pass away, churches crumble to decay, battles are won and lost, but the spirit of man endures. Perhaps after all, even in this age, religion is the supreme thing.

The Authority for Law

What we call law as applied to society is the body of rules established for the purpose of enabling individuals to live in a social group. Thus the purpose of law is to facilitate the very object of social organization, that is, to obtain a greater amount of security for the individual. Thus considered, law may be divided into three parts.

First, there is what we call the mores, or perhaps better, the folk-ways. These consist of habits, customs, and rituals that have grown out of the experience of men. They are written as it were, not on tablets of stone, but upon the hearts of the people. Their origins are lost in the dim shadows of the prehistoric period. The "why" of many of these customs never can be discovered. On the other hand, the origin of many of these that have to do with the seasons of the year, is easily understood.

Then there is the common law growing even as the folk-ways out of the experience of mankind; in fact, resting back upon the consensus of opinion as to what was just and right, long antedating the establishment of recognized permanent courts. The common law is not merely the opinion of the judges, but the interpretation and the recording of what was generally accepted by the people as rules of conduct.

Third, there is what is known as statutory law. Again this law, though in written form, designed to meet the needs of the time in which it is enacted, nevertheless, only has significance as it expresses what men feel generally to be just and fair. Even a law which directly benefits, a law like a tariff law, is only justified on the ground that indirectly it benefits all the people. It is only on this ground that it is to be defined as a just law.

What we call law then as a social instrument, is not an entity dwelling outside human experience. It is not a supernatural force. It grows out of the recognition that rules of conduct are essential to the welfare of the individual living in a social group. This is as true of the so-called moral law as it is of laws relating to the driving of automobiles upon our highways. "Thou shalt not kill," meaning, of course, thou shalt not kill, except in accordance with social rules and regulations governing killing, is not more a divine law, a heavenly decree, than the law forbidding spitting on the sidewalk.

Mankind early discovered that rules against indiscriminate killing were highly advantageous from the standpoint of personal security. The enforcement of such a law or mores, was greatly facilitated by the belief, which was probably assiduously cultivated by the priestly kings who had special concern for their own safety, that the spirit of the murdered man would haunt the killer. It was deemed highly disturbing to say the least, to have the spirit of the man you murdered lingering around your tent or doorstep. Undoubtedly, as Frazer says, superstition was very effective in many cases in establishing many mores that proved of value to humanity. They were the ancient instruments for putting teeth into the law.

We know that Sabbath observance does not rest for its authority upon either of the reasons given in the Hebrew Bible. The Sabbath was not observed because the Lord rested upon the seventh day; it was not observed in commemoration of the Israelites' escape from Egypt. It rested fundamentally as we know, upon a very primitive form of nature worship associated with the phases of the moon. From the point of view of the moon, of course, there is no rhyme or reason in it, but one day's rest in seven has proved to be beneficial to mankind. Thus when moon-worship is a part of our mythical lore, and the story of God's writing with his finger upon the tablets of stone is only a story coming out of the childhood of the race, men still after one fashion and another recognize the law of the Sabbath.

What we call moral law, is therefore relative. There is no absolute law in this field. With the recognition of this fact there disappears the idea of the absolute law-giver. In several fields of human experience we discover that what we once thought were norms of conduct, are on the contrary, rules that have changed as men have, as the environment of men, using the word environment in the widest sense, has changed.

Folk-ways and common law grew very slowly out of experience. As man's knowledge deepened and widened, certain folk-ways ceased to have meaning and they became only interesting relics, comparable to museum pieces that we look upon as curiosities; reminders to us of the life of our ancestors in by-gone ages. Such folk-ways as survive, survive entirely because they have value and mean-

ing today. They are accepted not because they are a law imposed, but because they are a rule of life that works. They survive only as they are generally accepted by mankind. Some of these have become translated into statutory law, as for instance, the rules of the road, but they only became statutory law because they were found to be generally acceptable.

The same is true of the common law. So long as its principles and the particular expression of these principles are in harmony with what men feel to be fair and equitable, they survive. It is true that because of the slowness of men to accept any change, many common laws yield slowly, perhaps in many cases too slowly, to meet the changing conditions of life.

In statutory law men have found, however, a comparatively new instrument. They have found also new tools for the writing of this law. These tools are human beings organized in human bodies, legislative assemblies, parliaments. Thus no longer does law await the slow accretion of human experience and its recording in custom or folk-way. The assemblies that make statutory law are made up of men, human beings necessarily limited in their outlook, and because of this, incapable of forecasting the result of the law that is enacted. Folk-ways rested upon a long past; they were rooted in the experience of generations of mankind, but statutory law endeavors to meet an existing situation and deals primarily not with the past, but with the future, and because of the future, no man can prophesy with certainty; the effect of the law is necessarily uncertain.

Any law dealing with human relations is in itself a factor in the life of the people to whom it applies. As no one has lived under the new law, no one can foretell absolutely what the effect of the law will be upon the life of the people. With the very best intentions in the world, the legislative body may pass a law which may have in its effect, because of the reactions of the people to it, the entirely opposite effect to that which its makers desired.

It is also true that because of a lack of knowledge on the part of the law-making body, a law may be passed which is totally out of harmony with that strange, mysterious, undefinable thing we call "public opinion." Because of this the law becomes an active agent in the development of law-breakers in the community.

Because statutory laws are intended to apply to the unknown future, it becomes at once a matter of great importance that such law as far as possible, embody not only the experience of the past in so far as it throws light on the future, but also that the law be a recognition of that which has the approval of an overwhelming majority in the community. This means that laws should be passed with a great deal of caution, especially if they deal with vital human affairs and touch upon long-established social habits. Law-makers are human, however, and are therefore subject to emotional appeals. Whenever evangelistic fervor is substituted for sober judgment, it is obvious that great mistakes are liable to be made. It is easy to substitute shibboleths, party cries, flag waving for reasoned consideration of the situation.

It must be remembered that while the State is the executive arm of society, its only instrument is force. The State never can ask why. The State cannot enter an argument. Fundamentally it can only ask one question: did or did you not violate the law. After years of experience the community may through its legislative body record in a law that which is the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the citizens. Such a law is automatically observed; it is not enforced. It is true that a small minority of weaklings or unsocial folk who violate the law, are punished for the violation. The punishment may have some slight influence on others, but on the whole, it has no significance so far as law observance is concerned. The law is observed because people generally recognize the wisdom embodied in it. But if the law does not represent public opinion, then the State has no power of enforcement whatsoever. For the State, whose only weapon is that of force, can only use that weapon as it is permitted to do so by public opinion.

It is easy to understand how the above is true in a democratic community. In Williamson County, Illinois, some years ago several murders were committed in broad daylight. To be sure, there is a law against murder in Illinois, but in Williamson County no one was ever indicted for these crimes, although the persons who committed them were generally known. The thirteenth amendment to the Constitution is a part of the highest law of the land. It nevertheless has been openly and continuously violated for upwards of three-quarters of a century.

If we are going to face reality, see things as they actually are, we must recognize the fact that only as social rules and regulations grow out of human experience, do they have any real validity. Any attempt on the part of the minority to force upon the great mass of the people, a regime that is unwanted, is doomed ultimately to failure. It is for these reasons that I believe that laws, especially in the field of human relations, should only be enacted after they become the unwritten law in the hearts of the great mass of the people. We have on our statutes today many laws dealing with matters of sex, gambling and drinking. These laws never have

been, and I cannot conceive any time in a long, long future when they will be observed. There is a sufficient public opinion to sustain laws having to do with public prostitution; so also commercialized gambling. But laws dealing with the conduct of the individual in these respects, have never been observed; it is obvious they never can be enforced.

The community in which there is sufficient intelligence so that there is a general understanding of human nature, and the conditions under which mankind slowly evolves, may hope to avoid periods of storm and stress, violent upheavals, and what is known in history as revolution. Whether in America we possess enough intelligence to move forward with a minimum of friction, is today a very serious question.

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY.

Jottings

"George Sonowski, the Polish baron, termed by secret police 'one of the most dangerous spies in Europe,' has been traded for three German spies held in Poland, it was disclosed today." —Berlin despatch in the New York *Times,* May 3rd.

Reminds us of the old days of cigarette pictures, when we boys used to trade three Indian chiefs for a Pauline Hall in tights!

Litvinov sang "God Save the King" the other day when he met Captain Eden. Now Hitler has sent his congratulations on the occasion of the King's Jubilee. How all this must please George V.

England did not seem to get much excited about the Hitler menace, nor willing even to join the continental powers in defensive alliance against Germany, until the announcement of the building of the U-boats. Airplanes, a conscript army? O well, why worry? But *submarines!* Ah, that's another story. It "looks ominous," says MacDonald. For the first time since September, 1931, we find ourselves agreeing with the British Premier.

FOR SALE:

(a) Silver, mined or minted. Name your own price, and the U. S. government will pay it.

(b) The Versailles Treaty, torn into a thousand badly damaged pieces. Fit only for the scrap-heap. No bid too low to be accepted.

(c) Father Coughlin's National League for Social Justice. An article of enormous political value, purchaseable by any presidential candidate who will outbid all others.

A native tribe in the Punjab, India, has agreed to suspend cattle-stealing for a year in honor of King George's Jubilee. Here is a hint for the so-called civilized nations of the earth. Why not call off mass murder, otherwise known as war, for a century in honor of the Prince of Peace?

How the politicians gather when votes are in sight! See them cluster around Father Coughlin and his eight million signed-up members of his Social Justice League. Bees around a honey-pot, or pigs around a swill trough, are nothing to it.

J. H. H.

Chaplaincies for the Dead*

It happens to be Memorial Sunday on which I am writing this article. It is Memorial Sunday here with more than ordinary emphasis, because the church next door is today celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of its organization. There is a yet more peculiar emphasis upon this particular day for me, for the church next door is, and is not, the church where I was minister myself quarter of a century ago, and for the twelve years following. And it is a church where, as I see it, and say it with regret, Congregationalism failed of its largest opportunity in California, though Congregationalists quite unanimously are unaware of the fact. Let me have a little space to explain.

The church next door, I am speaking of the building now, was, in the main, the First Baptist Church of Los Gatos, quarter of a century ago, when I assumed the pastorate in early June, 1909. Half a block to the east of us, in a much poorer building, and with a much less favorable location, because wedged in between other buildings as our corner was not, stood the First Christian Church of Los Gatos. The two buildings are together now, that which was the Christian church building attached to the rear of the building which was our's, as "Proctor Hall," named for the only surviving charter member of the Christian Church, who will be honored in the building named for her in the noon-day banquet following the morning services today. The Christian Church is now in control of the whole property, and the church to which I ministered has ceased to be. Three blocks to the east, on the other side of the beautiful Los Gatos creek which flows through the center of the town, there is another building, erected about ten years ago, in which what is now known as the First Baptist Church of Los Gatos carries on. It was established by a small contingent of members who went out from the church of which I was pastor, and were given the means to build mainly by one man who was never a member with us, by reason of an orthodoxy on his part which could not endure the mildest religious liberalism. The church which he so subsidized is so orthodox now that it has for many years refused

*This article was written on Memorial Day, 1934. For reasons which need not be detailed here it was not available for publication at that time, and, by request of the author, has been held over a year that it might be published in time for Memorial Day consideration this year. The references to Congregationalism are incidental, and not intended as particular criticism of that denomination.

to fellowship the Baptist churches generally in California.

All of this detail may seem for the moment irrelevant to general interest and importance, but this importance will appear as I go on. Indicative of it is the fact that a few years ago, midway of the twenty-five years since I began my ministry here, Dr. John Haynes Holmes and Professor Scott Nearing held a debate in New York City on the subject: *"Resolved,* That a church cannot be radical." Scott Nearing maintained the affirmative; Dr. Holmes maintained the negative. And Dr. Holmes, who had visited Los Gatos and spoken for us during my ministry at this point, used our church as evidence that a church could be radical. Whatever was thought of his proof then there would be less inclination generally to use our experience as evidence to such effect now.

As a matter of fact our church was not radical at that time, though most of its members, most of the community, and most of those who visited with us on the frequent occasions when men and women came hundreds of miles to visit with us, thought us radical. We were liberal, more liberal than liberals are generally, liberal enough, in fact, to open our pulpit to a banker or an I.W.W., with equal hospitality, the preference if any being rather on the side of the I.W.W. as the man who was most misunderstood, and had usually the most to say that was provocative of new lines of information and thought.

But looking back upon that twelve years ministry of mine now, the longest, the most interesting, and, despite what I am about to say nevertheless the most significant ministry I have had in my fifty years of pulpit and platform experience, I am convinced that there were not a dozen members of our church and congregation then who knew what I was mainly trying to say. Perhaps the fault was in the manner of my saying it. I am sure that I could say it much better now. But I am not at all sure that the effect of my improved saying of it would be essentially different. This I confess, after a wide observation of those ministries of the present hour where here and there a pulpit prophet is laboring to get over to his people the prophetic message of this hour. *I do not know a church which shows any signs of understanding in any considerable degree, as an organization, what the minister is talking about when he says what moves him most profoundly in the way of really radical thought.*

The churches are chaplaincies for the dead. All over the land, even where they think they are awake to the awful obsoleteness of the military mood, and its utter irreconcilability with the spirit and message of Jesus, they are offering special inducements today for old soldiers, and their present military entourage, to attend upon Memorial Services either at the morning or evening hour, and receive such recognition as no church has ever thought of observing to especially memorialize upon a "Militant Prophets' Day" those who have led in the warfare to realize the kingdom of God among men. What day is set apart, even by the most liberal religious bodies, to commemorate the leaders of modern thought who have walked the ways of Calvary with the Christ, to build a world after his pattern?

Actually, when I was in Seattle, following the close of my pastorate in Los Gatos, and for a year in temporary charge of a Congregational church which had been royally and sacrificially served by one of the truest prophet souls the Congregationalism of the Pacific Coast has ever known, Dr. Sydney Strong, I had this amazing experience. One Sunday, when in the Sunday School hour I was talking to the young people's class, I asked the group before me who David Starr Jordan was. And, will you believe it, although Dr. Jordan had spoken in that pulpit not many years before, and was at the hour the outstanding figure in the educational field of the Pacific Coast, not one of those young people, High School students in several instances, could place the man.

But to return to Los Gatos. During my first eight years here, from 1909 to 1917, there was on the whole a remarkable response to the liberal theological message which I preached, particularly, odd to say, among the older people. They were shocked at first, disturbed profoundly in some instances, but except for the seven who went out from us, they came through with a sweetness and courage I can never forget, or fail to appreciate. And we had a much more friendly community response than I could have expected. When, against my own indifference to political office, I consented, for educational reasons, to run for Congress in this Eighth Congressional District, *on the Socialist ticket,* to my surprise, and without any personal canvassing on my part, and only one public meeting here, I carried Los Gatos, and the district north of the town, by a considerable majority. It meant nothing in the way of real radicalism, of course, but was mainly a personal complimentary vote. But is it given here as indicative of the measure in which my church and I had the good-will of the community.

Then came the world war. I knew in advance that I could not support it, even when our President and Congress voted us into it. I offered to go away for the period of the war, and let the church go on without me, free from the burden of disrepute and persecution which I knew my course would involve. But the church as a whole stood by me even then, though some withdrew, but without seeking to build up any opposing organization. Even when I went to jail, in Los Angeles, as a pacifist, the church carried on during my absence, and welcomed me back to the pulpit while the town was still hostile to me. For this the church was never forgiven. The Baptist denomination here in California had already forsaken us before I took my anti-war stand, because, at my suggestion, our church had adopted Open Membership, and allowed non-immersed people to join us without submitting to a ritual which they did not feel was of any importance to them. Incidentally it is noteworthy that under our Baptist doctrine of individual church autonomy Baptists of other churches looked tolerantly upon my non-orthodox theological and sociological views, *until I broke with them at the point of the baptistry.* The ordinance had for them first importance when it came to ecclesiastical association. Ours was, if I mistake not, the first Baptist Church in the United States to adopt full freedom as to membership *with or without baptism in any form.*

In consequence of this, after I left Los Gatos, in 1921, to give the church opportunity to function here without carrying longer the load of my discredit as a pacifist and a radical, the church called a Congregationalist to its pulpit, and went over formally to the Congregational fellowship. But social radicalism, even in the mild measure in which the church had it, proved as unworkable under the Congregationalists as had ecclesiastical heresy under the Baptists. Two Congregational ministers followed each other in the ministry here, both men of rare spirit and character. The church

was reduced in membership; the community was in a measure still hostile for the favor which had been shown to me, and was shown whenever I returned on two or three occasions, and both men left for lack of adequate support. Therefore those who remained of the fellowship to whom I had ministered turned the property over to the Christian Church, which is carrying on here *substantially as it did fifty years ago.* I say this with no touch of bitterness, for I am invited to attend and speak at the Memorial Banquet in "Proctor Hall" today. Ill-will, consequent upon my anti-war stand, has largely died away, and the community is either friendly or indifferent toward me. *But the churches here are all functioning, as are churches generally, as chaplaincies for the dead.*

The Congregationalists might have saved the day here, and done a piece of pioneering which we had incipiently under way in my years following the war, a piece of work of which there is tragic need both on the Pacific Coast and in the country at large. I can state it, suggestively, in a few words. The need is for some church which may function only incidentally in a local way, but as a *prophetic fortress might serve all the churches in the interests of the new order of church life which is yet to be.* If I may say it so, there is need of a church in every distinct geographical area of the United States, which will do for religion what the Soviet Republic is seeking to do for the political and economic life of the world, that is, to blazon the path toward a new order of affairs. Such a church must needs be found in some "Nazareth" community, for no "Jerusalem" will carry it, unless it be found on the outskirts of some large city. It will necessarily be poor, and remain poor. It will hardly have official support, but it ought to have, and I think can have support from many who are scattered abroad. There was rare opportunity here. It is gone. But I am telling the story, discussing the issue, because I think there are possibilities elsewhere, if ministers and church folks can be brought to see it, and get behind the prophetic message when it captures some strategic point. Generally speaking the churches are all memorializing the dead. Dare they make room for a prophetic plant, which shall abandon in its practical workings, and in its wide-spread evangelism, not only the dead denominationalisms of the past, the dead emphasis upon this or that bit of ritual and dogma, but the dead social order which has so involved the whole life of the world in the catastrophic world-ruin of today? One church organization, however poor in material substance; however locally in disrepute; however limited in apparent opportunity to carry abroad the prophetic message; if, as an organization, committed to the repudiation of all the war-worshipping habits which our Memorial Day stresses, committed to an affirmative non-sectarianism which is not the colorless, compromising thing by way of which many Community churches have their being, but is outspoken for everything the community lacks in real religious understanding; committed to utter openness on behalf of the most radical social message; one such church would be worth the experimental faith and courage of any denomination, and would mightily serve all. The failure here may have been primarily my fault. If so, I can but make this atonement, in pleading with the prophet-minded in our church councils and congregations, to keep open eyes if in the providence of God such another Nazareth shall be found, that they miss it not.

ROBERT WHITAKER.

To Avert World Disaster*

When I was a boy it was dinned into my ears that the Civil War had cost one billion dollars. *One billion dollars!* That amount represented the largest conceivable sum during the 70s. How far we have traveled from those days of financial simplicity! And finally the World War came in 1914 and thereupon a billion dollars became a mere blue chip in the international poker game of that fierce struggle. Before the game stopped 400 billion dollars had been consumed in the fire of war. Like an inveterate gambler the world got the habit of playing all games with billion dollar chips—war games and peace games. And so, although the War bankrupted the world, that same world has invested over 50 billion dollars since the 1918 armistice in the building fresh instruments of slaughter, euphoniously called "armaments for defense." Each of the big powers preaches the gospel of good will and peace but catches the competitive contagion of outbuilding its neighbor in war-machines. Europe sets the pace and forces the United States to keep up with the military procession, while, incidentally, we acquire the reputation of both hypocrisy and militarism. And so, while the nations worry about food, clothing and shelter for hundreds of millions of their impoverished people, 6 billion dollars are squeezed every year from their taxpayers to build implements of destruction for the next ghastly war, with white civilization as the stakes. Thus we get "more for our money"—more economic distress, more taxes, more misery, more distruction, more death—in short, more war.

What can be done to avert the greatest impending man-made disaster of all time? Or is the world bankrupt also in statesmanship and common sense? More especially, what is America's duty in this fateful crisis and what can she do?

Our own great Emerson almost a century ago prophetically pointed the way. He closed his Essay on War with the following imperishable words:

> Not in an obscure corner, not in a feudal Europe, is this seed of benevolence laid in the furrow, with tears of hope; but in this broad America of God and man, where the forest is only now falling, or yet to fall, and the green earth opened to the inundation of emigrant men from all quarters of oppression and guilt; here, where not a family, not a few men, but mankind shall say what it shall be; here, we ask, shall it be war or shall it be peace?

May the Emersonian prophecy of the Nineteenth century become a triumphant reality of the Twentieth century! America is challenged to no greater practical or more spiritual mission. The European nations, torn by the ravages and resentments of the War, and aroused and terrified by ever-increasing competitive armaments,

*A coast to coast broadcast (CBS) of May 7. In introducing Mr. Levinson to his radio audience as "a distinguished international lawyer who has dedicated his life to the realization of an ideal for a larger client—a sick, saddened world seeking the way of peace and prosperity," Mr. Arthur Andersen called attention to the fact well known to the readers of UNITY, that it was through Mr. Levinson's efforts that there came the significant chain of events which lead to the negotiating of the Kellogg-Briand Treaty, the so-called Pact of Paris, for the outlawry of war.

are apparently helpless to avert the fateful consequences of their own embittered relationships. The United States, happily free from the embitterments of the War, is in an effective position to forestall and prevent an otherwise inevitable crash. Our economic interests are so bound up with those of other nations that the work of conciliation and adjustment would redound to our own great advantage and benefit.

The United States invested 40-odd billions of dollars in the war; it asked and took no dollar of reparations or inch of territory at the peace table. The United States is the only clear creditor among the nations, all the Allies as well as Germany owing us large war debts.

The plan prepared by me and sponsored and published March 11th last, by the Business Men's Committee of Chicago, of which Mr. Arthur Andersen is the ideal chairman, proposes that the United States call a general conference of the nations to consider and solve all the important questions that now block international trade, prosperity, and world peace. There is needed the broadest and most comprehensive adjustment and clean-up possible. The piecemeal and partial settlements dragged out through the past thirteen years have got the world nowhere in terms of durable accomplishment. The reluctant and disappointing concessions made through these years have engendered friction rather than good will. The time has come for the nations, whose peoples are all suffering from the burdens of the war and the depression, to work out a program of reciprocal concession and sacrifice for the common good. While the United States should deservedly take the leadership in this movement, and our people are willing to make further sacrifices beyond those already unprecedentedly made, we should not be asked to bear the lion's share of fresh concessions.

The conference should consider and equitably solve the following four vexing and vital problems: (1) reasonable cash compromise of the war debts owing us by the European Allies and by Germany; (2) drastic pro rata disarmament including an immediate 5-year holiday in arms construction; (3) stabilization of currencies by international agreement; and (4) revival of world trade. Such a meeting should be held in Washington, the home of the creditor.

The plan provides for the collection by us of 60 per cent of the original principal of these Allied and German war debts, payable in twelve annual installments, after giving credit for the moneys already paid. In consideration of the lenient settlement of the intergovernmental war debts and to accelerate durable peace, the nations to agree to an immediate 5-year holiday in arms construction, and to a gradual, pro rata reduction in armaments during this 5-year holiday period to substantially 50 per cent of their present strength. For if the arms reduction is pro rata the relative strengths would remain unchanged and every nation would automatically enjoy enormous financial savings. The nations, as stated, to work out and agree upon a practical program for the stabilization of currencies and such other measures as will restore confidence in our monetary units and promote and restore normal world trade. The savings from the proposed 5-year holiday period alone would almost repay to the United States the balance of the original principal of these war debts, would furnish the European nations adequate savings wherewith to make the compromise annual payments, and would enable every nation forthwith to balance its budget. Here, through the sanity of peace, by an international live-and-let-live policy, in a determination of civilized man to prove himself higher than the beast, yea, higher even than the uncivilized though less warlike man, we can also attain our sponsor's economic objective of "more for your money"—more freedom, more enjoyment of the fruits of the sweat of our brows, more real security for ourselves and posterity, more hope for the future; in short, more peace. For war is the most expensive and wasteful institution ever devised by the wit of man; hence we get from war the absolute least for our money. Peace is the reverse, the antithesis of war, is the least expensive and least wasteful of human institutions; hence, in peace we get a maximum more for our money. War is more murderous and grasping than banditry, for banditry says, "your money *or* your life," while war says, "your money *and* your life."

And in conclusion, drastic universal reduction of armaments would be the best possible guaranty of world peace and of the sanctity of peace treaties. By thus connecting up drastic reduction of armaments with drastic reduction of debts, by utilizing economic processes to procure political appeasement, by effective leadership instead of blind isolationism, the prophecy of Emerson could be fulfilled and his and our beloved America will have answered his inspired call to the task of establishing world peace.

SALMON O. LEVINSON

Flower Market

At the Flower Market in Rittenhouse Square
You discover the flower of Vanity Fair,
Possessed of so gracious a masquerade air
(Such a lark to be serving the common folk there!)
That one struts with a flaunt and feels debonaire
On beholding each lady, each colorful ware.
Why, a private rainbow seems caught in the snare
Of the Flower Market in Ritten. . . There stare
Two nondescript kids from, oh, just anywhere,
As wonder-eyed as they're touselled of hair,
While the guards and chauffeurs and police start to glare.
(By far these outnumber the ladies, I swear!)
Would the theft on the part of this flower-starved pair
Cry out with such terribly threatening blare?
You ladies of luxury giving more care
To a shrub or a plant, whether common or rare,
Than these children have ever received in the lair
Which with dozens of others they stuffily share
While from empty mansion to mansion you tear,
Oh, you're wise, you mesdames millionaire,
To campaign that no federal laws declare
Such children be freed from work. There might flare
In their hearts the question of why they should bear
This taunt that I wonder even you dare:
The Flower Market in Rittenhouse Square!

RALPH CHEYNEY.

National Patterns

The poppy fields of Asia flaunt their blooms before the sun,
Their silken petals covering the seeds that have begun
To prove their smallness equal to sending men to death
By way of whiffs of opium upon an indrawn breath.

The leaves of corn and sugar cane are rustling through the wind,
And luscious grapes are hanging where man has pruned and thinned
The vines to better yielding that they may become a drink
To ruin men more quickly than they can be taught to think.

The factories are creating their armaments of steel
To shatter men and women, even children's lips may feel
Impact of bullet as they run yet we pursue our gold,
And set our national patterns in a war-made battle-mold.

MARY CHANNELL STEVENS

Recovery for the United States*

I very much dislike to criticize the trend of events under the present administration; but now that it is starting on its third year I think it is about time that we take note of where we are going, and if that path is not one leading to recovery, then we should start to walk one which would tend more to bring the nation out of the depression than that which we have followed up to date.

Right after the new administration came into power it was necessary to do many novel things which would not ordinarily have been done in normal times. I am not criticizing that action at all. The banks were closed. Perhaps drastic measures had to be taken. Certainly the period immediately following the administration's advent ought to be viewed and judged with a wholesome degree of tolerance, whether we be Democrats or Republicans.

However, when such measures as the NRA, the AAA, and other alphabetical institutions came into being, members still under the spell of the depression voted for them without any real comprehension of what was involved. The so-called "elimination of child labor" is all right. The so-called "maximum-hours-of-labor provision" is all right. The so-called "basic standards," as it were, were proper to consider even in normal times. But when under the guise of the NRA we allowed business to come in and write its own ticket, when we glorified trusts to a new height, when we gave them privileges which they had never before enjoyed. I question very much whether we helped the country even temporarily by such procedure.

Likewise, when we put upon the statute books the AAA and various other measures supposedly designed to ameliorate the suffering of the people, I question very much whether that procedure, in turn, was justified even as an expedient. I am asking the question now, Is it not time to repeal these monstrosities and wipe them out in order to revive world trade, to reestablish our currency, to settle the war debts?

I do not mean to give our Republican friends a left-handed pat on the back, because I consider, notwithstanding the era of so-called "prosperity" through which we passed, that in the administrations of Mr. Harding, Mr. Coolidge, and Mr. Hoover the foundation was laid for the very depression in which we find ourselves. We had emerged from the war in the position of not any longer being a debtor country, but a creditor country. The world owed us sums of money which it could not pay, and yet we insisted on selling to the world more goods than we were buying from them, although their debts to us at that time were greater than they could possibly discharge. However, we kept up the illusion of prosperity through the medium of international loans. We proceeded to lend to our customers, who already owed us more than they could pay, the money with which to pay for the goods we were exporting to them.

In that day, everybody was for it so long as it lasted. Everybody was for prosperity. If anyone pointed to the fact that Cabinet officers were dishonest, that they were being tried for fraud, the answer was "prosperity." That was enough.

As long as the illusion lasted all America goose-stepped back of that so-called "prosperity," when anybody who knows anything about the elements of economics must have known that to some degree the depression was inevitable; that we could not go on putting our customers further and further into debt without the day coming when they could not buy any more.

We criticized the Republican Party; and what I considered to be the mandate of the Democratic Party was the platform of the party written in Chicago in 1932. That was the platform upon which we were all elected. I was a candidate at that time. What did the platform promise? It promised a revival of world trade. It promised a balanced Budget. It promised to pay as we went. I have not seen any election since then which has altered the promises which we made in that platform.

What is the Democratic Party now doing? I am not seeking to hurt the Democrats; but I believe the time has come to raise our voices in warning, for before another year shall have gone by there may not be the large Democratic majority here and in other places which we have enjoyed. We cannot go on running the Government on hot air, on money pulled down from the heavens which the taxpayers will have to pay back. We cannot continue on the philosophy of scarcity, of producing less and less and expecting to employ more and more people. We can no longer do that with any degree of success, because the less work there is, the less we produce, the less employment there is. Up to this time the whole philosophy of the administration, in my judgment, has been to produce less and to increase rather than to decrease the army of the unemployed.

We came into power, and what did we do? Complaining against the policy of ultranationalism, of embargo tariffs, of increasing our creditor position, we offered to the country a program, and we swept the country. We carried all State elections; we carried most of the congressional elections; we even carried the municipal elections; and the Democratic Party, which is a minority party in the country, found itself almost in supreme command of every city, county, and State government, and even the National Government, and what do we do?

Instead of undoing the supernational policy of the past three administrations, we go further and accentuate it by devising in America not only the philosophy of scarcity but the philosophy of increasing prices so that we cannot compete in the markets of the world, and this in a country which produces more than its people can consume! How in the name of common sense can we ever reemploy the unemployed until we make markets all over again?

Every policy of the NRA is a policy to increase the cost of manufactured commodities. Every policy of the AAA is a policy to increase the cost of agricultural commodities, which makes us the less able to go out beyond our own country, or, indeed, even in it, and sell the things which we must sell in order not to increase further the army of the unemployed.

Think of it! Take cotton, for example, a crop of which we export over half of all we produce; and yet we are plowing under our cotton, and while we are plowing it under Brazil and Egypt and India are raising more and more and more of it. What are the farmers in the South going to do when other countries of the world raise sufficient cotton to supply the export trade which they formerly supplied? In what line of activity are we going to put those farmers? Are they

*The author of this article is Senator of the United States from Maryland. He is a member of the Democratic Party.—Editor.

going to make automobiles? Are they going to raise wheat? We are already exporting wheat. What work can they be given in a republic?

The time has come to turn back from this supernational policy and attempt to revive world trade, to reestablish international currencies, and to promote and increase the commerce of the world rather than to decrease it.

Talk about increasing the purchasing power of the people while we increase the cost of the commodities the people must buy! By so doing we defeat, almost in the hour of its creation, the very object we set out to obtain.

What good, forsooth, does it do any man if he gets a dollar a day more, if everything he has to buy costs him a dollar a day more? What we ought to do is to bring into balance the price of commodities and the price of labor. Labor cannot have the price with which to buy unless there is work, and work cannot be provided by pursuing a policy of less trade. That is the thing for which the Republicans stood, with their embargo tariffs, under the last three administrations. I do not say that in a partisan way. I believe many who voted for high tariffs in those days did so with the thought that such a policy was for the best interests of America; but where did it lead us? It led us to the greatest depression we have ever seen; and I know there are in the country thousands of Republicans who today believe in reciprocal trade who five or six years ago would have been bitterly opposed to it.

Are we Democrats going to pursue the policy of nationalism, of shutting ourselves off from the rest of the world? And if we are going to pursue it, how in the name of common sense are we going to reemploy the unemployed? If there is an answer to that question, I do not know what it is.

We have always favored laws which curtailed the activities of the large corporations—the "trusts," as we call them. The NRA is the greatest prop ever put under the trusts of America.

Talk about being a liberal! If being a liberal means to give the trusts more power than they ever before had, then I am no liberal. If being a liberal means not to trade with the other nations of the world, but to adopt a policy of isolation, to pursue the philosophy of scarcity, the philosophy of unemployment, then I am no liberal. If, on the other hand, being a liberal means not to place more power in the hands of the interests which are already strong enough to survive without additional power; if it means to revive world trade, to stimulate commerce, to find markets for the things we produce in superabundance, to operate on a sound money basis, to pay as we go, then I am a liberal, if those who believe in such a philosophy may be called liberals.

A few days ago the Senate passed a joint resolution called a "Public Works measure," in which we pursued the philosophy that the Federal Government is responsible for community affairs from one end of the nation to the other. If they cannot support their schools, we will do it; if they cannot support their aged, we will do it; if they cannot support their indigent, we will do it. They need not worry any more; we will do it all for the whole nation. That may be good philosophy, but I question whether we have not started something of such a nature that when the time finally does come to turn off the faucet, it will take a whole lot of courage to turn it off.

We are pursuing the philosophy that the greater the national debt the sooner we will get out of the depression. We are pursuing the philosophy that so long as we can borrow we will provide, unmindful of the fact that away down underneath the same fundamental forces that brought about the depression remain untouched and unchanged. . . .

I do not like to say this, because a false interpretation may be placed upon it, and I know that we did not mean to be other than generous; but, in my opinion, the policy pursued by this Government from 1919 to 1929 wrecked the world. We demanded promises to pay which could not be fulfilled under our economic set-up. We raised tariff barriers which were followed by all the other nations of the earth. We have the whole world locked up in watertight compartments, with the concomitant phenomena, militarism, dictatorships, depreciated currencies, embargo tariffs. Shall we go further along that road, or shall we be the strong nation that we are, the leader in a movement back to sound principles, to sound economics, and to peace and good will among nations?

What man feels that we can pursue the policy of nationalism, of plowing under every third row of cotton, of plowing under wheat, without other nations retaliating with whatever means are at their command?

We cannot depreciate the currency in this country without finding that other nations will take up the repercussion by any means at their disposal. Up to the present time there may have been reasons for depreciating the currency, but is it not time, instead of pursuing this nationalistic policy, this supernationalistic policy, that we face about and offer our hands to the other nations of the earth in an effort to stabilize currencies on a fair basis, and to revive world trade?

There is no magic in government, there is no magic in wealth. The fallacies of five centuries ago are the fallacies of today. There is no royal road to success, to wealth, or to a successful government.

There was the Mississippi bubble under John Law in France, when the currency was depreciated, and France was brought to the brink of bankruptcy; but we learned nothing from that.

There was the South Sea bubble in England, which had a disastrous effect; and we learned nothing from that. There was the tulip mania in Holland, when one little root of a tulip sold for as high as $5,000, others for $4,000, others for $3,000, until the whole of Holland went tulip crazy; but when the tulip craze was over, banks had closed, and bankruptcy and ruin fell to the lot of a great many people in delightful and thrifty Holland.

In one year France depreciated its currency dozens of times. Henry VIII resorted, in his wars with France, to depreciated currency over and over again. Bad as those things were then, when the world was not so closely knit, when nations were not so interdependent, they are infinitely worse today, because the repercussion is immediately felt, and there is immediate retaliation on the part of all the other nations surrounding.

Should we do these things because they have been done elsewhere, or should we do them because they are for the best interests of our own country?

God knows I do not believe there ever was a man in the White House who wanted to do more for the underprivileged people than does the present President of the United States, and it affords me no pleasure to

take issue with anything connected with his administration. I may be wrong; I have always been a poor prophet, and perhaps in the future will be even a poorer one, but I predict that unless we about face and walk back toward sanity, we will rue the day, and that we will realize that silence was not the part of friendship, the part of patriotism, or the way to assist in getting out of the depression.

Has not the hour come when bureaucratic government should be brushed aside and the legislative body reassert itself? There was ample justification for the largesse of power which we gave to the administration during the critical days of bank holidays and what not, but that time has passed; the banks are open. There is a certain amount of "normality," so-called. I think that now the legislature should reassert itself, or let us quit calling this a democracy, and be done with it, because it is no democracy at all.

Here we are providing for the expenditure of $5,000,000,000, an amount equal to 20 percent of our total national debt, without any strings tied to it worthy of the name. Do you think it will be expended efficiently, even if those at the top want it so expended? There will not be a member of Congress in either House who will not feel impelled, in the competition which will be engendered, to see that his state is fairly treated in the distribution of the funds, regardless of the unemployment or distress which may exist in his state.

There is not a state in the Union—I say this with measured words—which, in my humble judgment, cannot support its schools. I believe it would be hard on many of the states; I believe that taxation would be almost unbearable; but I know, without being able to prove it, that there is not a state in the Republic which could not support its school system if the Governors and the legislatures of the respective states wanted the school systems supported by the states rather than by the Federal Government. There might have been a time after 1933 when that was not the case, but I believe that time has passed. I think we are evolving into a situation which we would have had anyway in 1921, 1922, and 1923, if it had not been that by international loans we created the illusion of international prosperity. We loaned our customers the money with which to buy the goods which we exported in abundance.

Some men say that world trade does not amount to much. They say that even in the good years it was the equivalent of only 8 or 9 or 10 percent of all we produced. Then, by the same logic, I say that unemployment does not amount to much, because we have only about 10 or 15 percent of our people unemployed. Why worry about it? But, if we could get back the trade we have lost, we could to a large extent get those who are unemployed back to work.

The Democrats have always been a party which believed in the principle that with more trade there would be more work and more prosperity, and not a party which believed that with less trade there would be more work and more prosperity.

We will be in this depression, in my humble judgment, until there shall be some stabilization of world currencies, difficult though that may be. I am not saying we can stabilize currencies in the next five minutes, but I am asking for the effort to stabilize them, for the desire to stabilize them, not for the desire to run our country as if we were not a part of the world. . . .

Where are the wheat farmers to sell their surplus wheat while we are forcing every other nation to be self-contained? Where are the cotton farmers to sell their cotton surplus while we are forcing our competitors to raise more and more cotton? Shall we pursue this policy for four or five more years, and then change it and find even at that early date that we are too late because in the meantime the cotton markets which we used to supply will have been supplied by those who previously did not produce cotton? That is the alternative.

It affords me no pleasure to say these things, but I think we have been too docile. I think in our high regard for those in extreme authority most of us have been quiescent, questioning, but willing to trust. Up to now I have not seen anything which would make me feel that in such an attitude lies the path of patriotism or the pathway to recovery. . . .

We raise cotton in sixteen States. In most of those states it is the principal agricultural money crop. I found in the Statistical Abstract of 1932, the figures being those of the United States Census Department, the number of farmers engaged in cotton production, and then from those figures I attempted to eliminate the farmers in the 16 States who do not produce cotton as a primary crop; and my calculation showed that nearly 1,800,000 farmers raise cotton as their principal agricultural money crop. If that be true, and if we export half the cotton, it is a logical deduction that about 850,000 American farmers rely upon cotton sold outside the United States for their bread and butter. If the policy of scarcity shall continue to be followed, if the policy of high-priced cotton, which is encouraging the production of low-price cotton elsewhere, shall be maintained over a period of 10, 20, 30, or 40 years, until our export cotton trade shall be absorbed by the foreign producing cotton countries, what are the 850,000 farmers now making a living out of raising and exporting cotton going to do for a livelihood? Allowing four persons to a farm family, the means of living will be taken from about 3,200,000 agriculturists in this country.

The danger lies not so much in the immediate prospect, but we have adopted a policy, under the guise of temporary necessity, and to all intents and purposes are embracing it "until death do us part." We are marrying this policy as a permanent wife. Nobody is thinking any more of terminating it in a year or two years or three years. We say these measures are temporary, but in the meantime we have done nothing to keep intact the foreign markets we now have and those we are slowly gaining back through reciprocal-trade agreements.

Now, coming to wheat, making the same observations in reference to wheat as I made in reference to cotton, I ascertained that before the depression we used to export 18 percent of the wheat which we produced in America. Translating that 18 percent into farm families, we find that about 282,000 farmers, principally in the West, relied upon the export wheat market for their livelihood. Including their families, about 1,000,000 people are involved. Under the policy now being pursued, our wheat exports are declining, our wheat imports are increasing, I am advised, although I myself have not verified the figures. If, therefore, we encourage other countries of the world to produce more wheat, to such an extent that they can send it to the United States, what are the 282,000 farmers who produce wheat for export going to do when that market

shall be gone? Thus, we have another million Americans whose livelihood will be taken away from them, and when the 3,200,000 Americans in the cotton-growing States and the 1,000,000 Americans in the wheat-producing States lose their income and their purchasing power, they will, in turn, throw others out of work who are directly or indirectly dependent upon their earnings for their livelihood. So the vicious circle goes on just as it has gone on during the depression.

I did not vote for the AAA; I did not vote for the NRA. If I had been what we used to call a reactionary, conservative, old guard Republican, I think I would have voted for them, because that is the sort of thing that men of that particular philosophy used to believe in, namely, turning over the Government to the "big boys" at the top, allowing them to sit down and write their own codes and fix prices, and let a little of the wealth trickle down to the poor people away down below. I did not think the Democrats were going to come along so soon and put the mantle of purity on the shoulders of that sort of political monstrosity.

I do not want to be unfair to Mr. Hoover, or to be too fair to him, either, but in his administration the depression was bearing down greater and greater every day. As I said regarding the first two years of the present administration, I am not criticizing any one of the high authorities of the Government for legislation of expediency. I realize that new and novel and untried measures had to be thrown into the hopper, perchance. What I am now asking, as we enter upon the third year is: Is it not time that we started to abandon some of these things and to deal with fundamentals and try to erect something that will provide more permanent security than the measures which we are now embracing as all-time propositions?

I want to look with tolerance, I want to look with liberality, and I think all people ought to look with liberality, upon the trials of the man in the White House, who came in on March 4, 1933, with a bank holiday on his hands, following three years of the depression, with unemployment rampant and with world trade disorganized. I say we ought to judge him with the greatest amount of liberality; but is it not time that we get down underneath, find out the things that are wrong, put those things out, and make an end of these temporary policies as soon as possible, in the hope that, through some effort, we may stabilize international currency, revive world trade, settle the war-debt question, if you please, bring about some measure of international co-operation and peace and good will and disarmament, rather than to pursue mad policies which already have brought Europe to the brink of war and may, before we know it, plunge all Christendom into a holocaust that will be followed by a wave of Socialism or Bolshevism, if statesmen and peoples have not the intelligence to hold back on the mad course that some people, who are following ultra-nationalistic policies would pursue? By that I do not mean that we ought to be a Simple Simon and go into this, that, and the other thing all over the world; but it seems to me that we can very appropriately make an effort to stabilize currencies and revive world trade, particularly when, after two years we have no dividends to show that the policies we have adopted have brought us any success.

MILLARD E. TYDINGS.

Washington, D. C.

The "Farley" Bill—a Menace

A bill (HR 5370, introduced by Congressman Higgins of Massachusetts, and S. 1541, introduced by Senator Hayden of Arizona) is now before the House Senate Post Office Committee, and Post Office Subcommittee. Post Office Solicitor Karl A. Crowley, in transmitting the proposed new legislation "at the request of the Postmaster General" wrote:

> The distribution centers for obscene matter are for the most part the larger cities of the United States and in some of these cities it is practically impossible to obtain any action under the existing statute against the person or concern which deposits the matter in the mails. Unsolicited literature, advertising the . . . sale of contraceptives and pornographic books, pamphlets and photographs, is broadcast promiscuously from these centers and thrust upon the addressee without regard to age or sex and when complaint is made the recipient cannot understand why the senders are not prosecuted. In such cases it should be possible to bring criminal action in the jurisdiction where the matter is delivered, for that is where the real harm is done.

Ostensibly the purpose of this bill is to make conviction easier by permitting prosecution of sender (or receiver) of pornographic material at the place of receipt as well as at the place of origin.

But (and note that Crowley states this without hesitation) the effect would be to tighten still further the present restrictions on the distribution of scientific contraceptive literature and supplies.

Congressman Pierce, of Oregon, attempted to avoid this set back by submitting an amendment asking that the medical profession be exempt from the provisions of the bill in matters pertaining to contraception. He pointed out the present anomalous situation of Federal laws forbidding what state laws permit, and said:

> The curious association of contraception with obscenity present in Section 211 and other sections of the criminal code, is the result of the failure of recent Congresses to modernize an act of March 4, 1873, passed without the slightest thought or reference to scientific birth control.
>
> Considered solely from the aspects of Federal and state power, section 211, insofar as it refers to contraception represents a clear-cut invasion of states' rights. In all but a very few states, probably not over three, the medical profession is not forbidden to prescribe contraception, just as it prescribes other scientific measures for the preservation of life and health.
>
> Consequently it appears that in at least an overwhelming majority of the states, the medical profession may lawfully obtain and dispense the information and material which, under present section 211, the profession cannot receive through the mails . . . an anomalous situation perhaps unique in our legislative history.

At the Hearing before the House Post Office Subcommittee on April 4th, Dr. Prentiss Willson, secretary of the National Medical Committee on Federal and State Contraceptive Legislation, and Dr. Eric M. Matsner, medical director of the American Birth Control League, testified in support of Pierce's amendment, showing that contraception is a necessary health measure. "I am opposed to this bill unless amended," said Dr. Willson.

> We are all in favor of prohibiting what is really pornographic and obscene, but not to leaving to the discretion of a postmaster or some rural judge or jury the decision as to what is obscene and what is medical and scientific.

Margaret Sanger, when called upon to testify, brought out the fact that *The Rhythm,* with enclosed explanatory calender, has been declared mailable, but

that *Contraceptive Practices* by Dr. Hannah M. Stone, has been declared non-mailable. With dates and details Mrs. Sanger told the Committee what was obviously news to them. Namely that *one* book, which has the approval of the Catholic Church, may pass unmolested through the mails to *anyone,* man or woman, married or unmarried, full grown or adolescent, whereas the *other,* written by a physician for *physicians* is classed with obscenity and considered non-mailable.

A second Hearing was called for April 10th. The clearly drawn battle-line between the Catholics and those who believe that scientific birth control is a necessary factor in public health was shown in those who appeared. Monsignor Ryan, representing the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Miss Agnes J. Regan, representing the National Council of Catholic Women, and Mr. Edward J. Heffern, executive secretary of the National Council of Catholic Men, spoke —and that vehemently—against the proposed amendment to exempt the medical profession in matters pertaining to contraception. There was much sword rattling of the number of people (voters, by implication) in these organizations, much dogmatism and bad logic.

But tragedy and horror, too, when Father Ryan answered the Chairman's question as follows: (Verbatim transcription.)

Chairman Ashbrook: May I preface my inquiry by saying that I have never declared myself to be an advocate or an opponent of birth control, and you can best judge that when I state that I am very proud to be the father of five children, ranging from 4 to 12 years, and I wish that I had that many more. Do you believe that there are no conditions or circumstances under which, and under the handling of a regularly licensed physician, birth control is warranted?

Monsignor Ryan: If you are asking whether I believe there are any conditions in which a physician would be morally justified in recommending artificial prevention of conception, I should have to answer that there are not any such conditions, any more than there are circumstances justifying the recommending of abortion—which, as I have said, is murder of a human being.

Mr. Ashbrook: You think it would not be *justified or warranted even to save the life of a mother?*

Monsignor Ryan: *No.* Not any more than the killing of a fetus would be justified, the doctor killing the fetus, subordinating the life of the fetus to the life of the mother.

Morris Ernst, nationally known authority on censorship, and attorney for practically all the important obscenity and birth control cases during the last fifteen years, gave a brilliant summary of censorship, and the history of the present obscenity laws. He said in part:

This committee has the greatest opportunity of any in Congress to make a real examination of this situation. The problem of birth control is the most important social problem facing the race. During the first hundred years in the history of this nation, there was no censorship whatsoever through the Post Office of either obscenity or birth control. The Founding Fathers were opposed to the use of the Post Office as a means of censoring anything, and believed that the only things which should be kept out of the mail bags were things that could actually hurt a man or physically injure the mail.

After 100 years of complete tolerance, Comstock came down to Washington in 1870, and stampeded Congress with a lot of shocking post cards into putting the present postal legislation on the statute books.

Mr. Ernst denounced the Post Office department for permitting *The Rhythm* to circulate freely, while it banned scientific books.

Here ensued a quibble over the words prevention and avoidance, Congressman Dobbins of Illinois claiming that the safe period book did not fall within the restrictions of the law since it dealt with the *avoidance* of conception, not the *prevention* of conception.

In summary, Ernst made clear that he believed all censorship to be a matter for the individual states to deal with. He was confronted with the actual samples of the pornographic material the Post Office wished to check, and though he agreed that it should be checked, he held that this was something for the state courts to do, since the harm was done within their boundaries, to their citizens. To do otherwise, he contended was to endanger the freedom of the press.

As the Hearing closed, and congressmen, witnesses and spectators were shuffling into their wraps *The Rhythm* innocent looking little book, with baby heads smiling out from its dust wrapper, was again waved in the air:

Mrs. Sanger: I am amused to hear Monsignor Ryan and Miss Regan talk in this way when their own book and another such book (The Sterile Period in Family Life) with the *Imprimatur* of Cardinal Hayes is sold at random. The same effect is obtained by the safe period and a means of contraception, presumably. I think it is inconsistent to come here and object when we are simply trying to place this matter in proper hands, so that there will be some proper control over the dissemination of this information.

Mr. Higgins (introducer of the bill): It is my impression that the chief post office inspector, Mr. Aldrich, would do a commendable thing for the Catholic Church if he barred that *damn book, The Rhythm,* from the mails!

And on this note the Hearing closed.

Meanwhile the Senate Committee quietly and without fanfare reported the companion bill favorably out of committee. But Senator La Follette of Wisconsin objected, saying that the bill had not been given due consideration, that he had not even been informed that a vote was to be taken, and the bill was recommitted.

At present, then, this post office bill is before the Post Office subcommittees in both houses. With the proposed amendment it is doubtless commendable legislation. Without it the enemies of birth control will have won a signal victory. Now is the time to act. Write your Congressmen. As individuals, as groups, as thinking citizens, as men and women who believe that birth control is a necessary part of normal, healthy, decent married life, urge the amendment to HR 5370, and to S 1541.

STELLA HANAU.

Attainment

Up from the slime and the matrix
Of the protoplasmic cell—
Up through the spineless reptillia
And the wingéd stage as well.

We watch instinctive consciousness
Play in the vertebrate rôle
And evolve to self-conscious knowing
As it climbs in them to a soul.

Man, the self-conscious knower,
Evolves to a further sphere
And senses the Cosmic Consciousness
In moments brief but clear.

Beyond the toil of the galley slave
And the sleep of the primitive cell,
Beyond the chattering monkey stage
When he strove his will to compel—

Now God-like he rises illumined
On the moral Olympus to shine,
Singing the song of freedom,
His heritage divine.

ELLA BAXTER WINN

The Study Table

Cromwell's Conquests

"Chamberlain victorious! . . ." For *now,* having painted pictorially "Cromwell's" rise and confusion, Mr. Garvin takes up the brushes once more, in order to portray him at apotheosis—a despot enthroned upon his Boer-crushing brazen chariot, brandishing on high the eagle standard of Empire: arrogant, defiant, triumphant. A trumpet-sounding apologue, in truth; and we may with some profit follow the marches of that battle-tide, hearing ever faintly the overtones of *Vanitas Vanitatum,* which warn us sibilantly of the paucity of earthly grandeur; that all mortal achievements can have but one end; and that the loftier the height, the greater the downfall. This debacle awaits us in the final (and unfinished) section of the canvas—meanwhile, let us follow in detail Cromwell's conquests, oblivious of the doom that must attend upon their vainglories.

We left the "Carnot" of English liberalism, then, backed by Lord Salisbury's iron dictatorship (1895), in command at the Colonial office, where, with all the engines of imperalism assembled about him, he proceeds forthwith to map out an extensive campaign to "reconcentrate" the Empire. Working day and night, bending all his resources to the task in hand, Chamberlain sweeps the reins swiftly into his grip, and launches his eminently efficient Juggernaut into an alarmed epoch, whose gaze he holds enthralled for a decade by his world-wide careering. First to come under the harrow is the barbaric king of Ashanti, in darkest Africa, prelude to still greater aggressions in the south—next there follows Protection for the dominions, as well as a cable for Canada and Australasia. A partly-pacific opening: all too soon to be superseded by the violence of earth-shaking events, as this mighty machine makes ready to ride rough-shod over the Boer Republics, with an accompanying crash whose reverberations carry a thunder of world catastrophe. His hand forced by the ubiquitous Rhodes, "Napoleon of South Africa," Cromwell's irrepressible conflict with Kruger now opens—provoked by Oom Paul, Garvin proves; but, nevertheless, whatever its immediate incitement, this interlude merely precipitates an inevitable British conquest of the Transvaal: a process as sure and decided as the steady impact southward of Chamberlain's victorious chariot. And, fearful of the impending power of Germany, Rhodes, urged at once by patriotism and Caesarism, starts on his ill-advised Jameson raid, destined to plunge two nations into war "and shake the pillars of a colonial empire which encircled the globe."

Preluded by an almost-fatal clash with America over Venezuela, embittered by the Kaiser's preposterous "Kruger" telegram, the infernal business goes merrily on its way—the renowned Raid is graphically portrayed; and Chamberlain exculpated, but to no purpose. That he staunchly opposed the crusade, cannot be denied: that his whole policy fostered and encouraged such action, is true. And the Kaiser's condemnation was not withheld. British anger flares high, in support of its imperialist Napoleon, not against him; and Cromwell, to avoid losing the game to Cecil Rhodes, henceforth must take a high hand. He does, demanding of the already-irritated Kruger unlimited franchise for the English "Uitlanders": the stubborn old Boer counters with "commercial advantages," but no mention of the franchise. An ominous argument (as continued by Lord Milner, doomed to end in swords), beneath which can be heard faintly echoes of that titanic conflict between Britain and Germany, all too soon to launch into the world a still greater Armageddon. . . .

The controversy, so speedily to be renewed in blood, now gives way upon Mr. Garvin's canvas to other momentarily more pressing matters: workmen's compensation; arbitration with United States; and an inadvertent side-thrust of the Juggernaut in the general direction of Egypt: all celebrated by the climacteric "Golden Jubilee," wherein the elements of Empire rejoiced in unison to trumpets and thunder over their imperial greatness, their matchless Queen, and their unconquerable Colonial secretary—commemorated in unexpected fashion at the very height of its feast by the sinister Psalm of Recessional, written by the prophetic hand of Rudyard Kipling on that Belshazzar's wall. An ominous warning, vindicated entirely too soon by the tragic march of events: Kitchener's brazen clash with Marchand at Fashoda, with humanity's fate trembling in the balance before the irresistible onrush of the Juggernaut; innumerable onsets with the Kaiser at Kiao-chow and environs; failure of Chamberlain's attempted alliance with Germany; Wilhelm's absurd ogling of the Czar, after betraying Cromwell; an interlude of friendship with America, during her bludgeoning of Spain; Germany's selfish abandonment of the Boers for Samoa before the coming conflict—and the final outbreak of war in South Africa, fanned into flame by the Bismarckism of Lord Milner and the Napoleonism of Paul Kruger: a catastrophic struggle which, from the first blood at Majuba, through the fiascos of Buller, the hateful hymns of Kipling, the spectacle of twenty thousand British dead on the veldt, and the saturnalia of Mafeking night in London, fills the remainder of this canvas; while, above all, thunders the spectral shadow of Cromwell's chariot, trampling down opposition and grinding a peasant republic to powder, with the redoubtable dictator at last yielding rein and allowing those four dreadsome steeds which draw him to work their awful will.

Here, then, let us leave Joseph Chamberlain, at sixty-five, victorious over his enemies, confidently expecting a speedy close of the conflict and a healing settlement, his still-youthful head bubbling with schemes for the future: old age pensions, unemployment insurance, some closer form of Imperial unity. To all and sundry, he seems the man of the future. But he has denied his early Liberalism by conniving with Toryism and Jingoism at a mighty crime; and the backwash of opprobrium from the war which he had not willed but allowed, is destined to work havoc with his future designs. So let us leave him, still awaiting the sequel wherein all disharmonious elements in that career will be dissolved by the eternal reagent of Nemesis. Mr. Garvin's brush, it may be said in passing, has lost none of its old cunning: the somber cynicism of Lord Salisbury; the delicate brusquerie of Arthur Balfour; the robust venality of Lord Halsbury; the sledge-hammer

The Life of Joseph Chamberlain, III, by J. J. Garvin. Published by Macmillan, 1934. $6.00.

methods of Lord Milner; Kitchener's "Day of Judgment" fury; Kruger's sullen ire—these, and a host of other piquant personalities, surround England's Chamberlain and make forever memorable this portion of his portrait. His "understanding zeal," his "courage and stimulant to courage," his grand audacity, his sardonic speech, are strikingly emblazoned upon a vividest of canvasses. Farewell, to him, then, until the final volume, wherein his finale takes place, and where those myriad facets of a many-sided character will at last be quenched.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

Correspondence

Billions in Tribute to the Money Changers

Editor of UNITY:

On March 5, 1935, the Treasury Department announced an offering of $1,850,000,000 in 20-25 year bonds bearing 2⅞% interest, and $528,101,600 in 5 year notes bearing 1⅝% interest.

This is Uncle Sam's greatest single tribute to the Money Changers since the World War and amounts to more than 1100 million dollars in so-called interest for the period these obligations have to run.

Huge as this sum is it only represents a small fraction of the tribute accorded the Money Changers on Roosevelt financing and refinancing since he became president.

During his campaign in 1932 Roosevelt held out great hopes to the "Forgotten Man" and upon entering office he promised to drive the Money Changers from the Temple.

It is hard to reconcile Roosevelt promises with Roosevelt performance and harsh words might well be used to express the indignation of a betrayed confidence.

The sad and tragic part is that this tremendous interest burden must come out of the meager earnings of the men and women who toil, and when the present generation passes on, the heritage of their children and their children's children is economic slavery and the continuance of the payment of unearned tribute to the Money Changers.

Are you going to continue to submit yourself to this system of economic slavery, or are you going to assert your God given right to demand justice for yourself and your offspring.

Write your Congressman and your Senator and demand the issuance of currency instead of bonds.

S. O. SANDERSON.

Rochester, Minn.

Poetry in America

Editor of UNITY:

I am quite disturbed over the editorial in the March 18 UNITY by Joseph Ernest McAfee. I rejoice over the fact that he appreciates and hails the new day of social passion and vision in poetry. It is true that "vast volumes of recent American poetry are highly introspective." But Mr. McAfee needs to be reminded that there has been a social vision movement in American poetry for many years before Mr. Paul Engle began his shallow generalizations.

There is Marcus Graham's "Anthology of Revolutionary Poetry," praised internationally, the introduction written by Lucia Trent and Ralph Cheyney, UNITY's poetry editors, who have been called by the *Christian Century* the leaders of the social vision movement in American poetry. There is the anthology compiled by Lucia Trent and Ralph Cheyney entitled "America Arraigned," the Sacco-Vanzetti protest, introduction by Dr. Holmes, called by Mark Van Doren the only book in America of its kind. Dozens of anthologies of social vision poetry have appeared in America, all of them testifying to the influence of Mr. and Mrs. Cheyney. There is the Cheyney's "More Power to Poets," which can be used as a text for the new movement, both in America and also tardy England. There is the statement by the New York *Times* which says "poetry has gone social if not Socialist." The inaccuracy of Dr. McAfee's article is evident.

LLOYD FRANK MERRELL.

Freeland, Michigan.

Why Pick on Mexico?

Editor of UNITY.

Some of our people are much disturbed about the persecution of Catholics by the anti-clerical government of Mexico. In the *Christian Century* of Chicago, R. H. Markham lately described the persecution exercised by the present clerical government of Austria, where men have been sent to prison for leaving the Roman Catholic church. In spite of close censorship, news is leaking out of atrocities in Spain. In England, at different times, Catholics have persecuted Protestants and Protestants Catholics, and, until very recent years, both have persecuted atheists.

Human nature is much the same in men of all religions and of no religion. Whether he is a Catholic, a Protestant or an atheist, anyone of ardent convictions is subject to the temptation to persecute, if he has the power. Then why pick upon Mexico? If we are going to protest, we ought to protest all around the circle.

C. G. M.

Boston, Mass.

The Academy of American Poets

Editor of UNITY:

As editor of a poetry magazine, I feel sure you will be interested in The Academy of American Poets, incorporated last November. The enclosed pamphlet describes our aims and purpose. We are receiving a most gratifying response to our nation-wide campaign.

May we count on your friendly co-operation to make known in every way the goal which The Academy of American Poets proposes to attain? We should appreciate an announcement of our work in your magazine.

MARIE BULLOCK.

New York City.

[Pamphlet]

No major country in the world has done so little for her poets as America.

Herein is explained the broad outline of a plan to free genius from the necessity of gaining a livelihood by almost any means except the means it was born to use.

A trust is in process of formation—to provide "fellowships" for poets of proven merit.

Specifically, there has been organized a membership corporation, "The Academy of American Poets," to receive donations.

This corporation will create a trust with donations received. Donors will be "members" of the corporation.

Fellowships will be awarded for a term of one year, carrying a stipend of $5,000. The award will be made by majority vote of "Chancellors" of the corporation.

"Fellows" must be American citizens, not possessed of a regular income in excess of $5,000 per annum. And no holder of a fellowship may engage in any gainful occupation other than such as may be approved by a majority of the Chancellors as not incompatible with poetic production.

Fellowships may be awarded to the same individual for successive years without limit.

The number of fellowships will be determined by the estimated income of the Trust.

"Honorary fellowships," without stipend and for life, may be bestowed by the Chancellors—with no limitation as to citizenship or income of the recipient. Active fellows will automatically become honorary fellows upon the expiration of their active fellowships.

The Chancellors will be American citizens, recognized as literary persons of high standing.

They will be twelve in number and a new Chancellor will be elected each year. Thus the normal term of office, other than for the initial Chancellors, will be a period of twelve years. Vacancies will be filled by majority vote of remaining Chancellors.

The trust will be subject to amendment through action of the Corporation's board of directors, with the unanimous consent of the Chancellors.

It is obvious the fellowships should be awarded by Chancellors to those they consider America's best poets.

Poetry in America should benefit indeed.

Anti-War Broadcast

Editor of UNITY:

I believe many readers of UNITY will be interested in a non-commercial radio broadcast, "How Can We Stay Out of War?" which will be on the air on five Wednesday evenings beginning May 8.

Station WABC and the Columbia network will present the program from 8:15 to 8:30 P. M. Speakers for May 8 will be Admiral William S. Sims and Raymond T. Rich, director of the World Peace Foundation. Others to be heard in the series are Professor James T. Shotwell, Dr. Raymond Leslie Buell, and Senators Nye, Pope and Thomas.

Pamphlets of the World Peace Foundation (8 West Fortieth Street, New York) that will be found helpful in conjunction with this radio series are "The Future of Sea Power in the Pacific," by Walter Millis, and "Conflicts of Policy in the Far East," by Professor George H. Blakeslee.

BERT H. DAVIS.

Utica, N. Y.

Thanks, Dear Friend!

Editor of UNITY:

I bless the day I ever subscribed to UNITY. Times are hard, but I hope to continue to be a reader as long as life lasts.

J. T. R.

Howell, Michigan.

The Field

(*Continued from Page* 102)

every Memorial Day. The graves decorated have been those of a factory worker, a railroader, a policeman and a fireman who lost their lives in the discharge of their duties and of a woman who died in childbirth.

Information and suggestions will be furnished free of charge to anyone addressing a request to the Peace Heroes Memorial Society, 842 Lexington Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio.

Birth Control Bill Supported by W. I. L.

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom went on record at the closing session of its annual meeting (Washington, May 5th) in support of the birth control bills now pending in Congress.

The Resolution, which was unanimously adopted reads as follows:

Whereas: It is generally recognized that population in relation to natural resources and world markets is one of the causes of war, and

Whereas: The intelligent control of population is a present need, and

Whereas: To achieve this intelligent control, scientific birth control information must be available for all classes, therefore

Be it Resolved, that we, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, support the bills now before Congress, S. 600 and HR 5600.

The American membership of the League is approximately 10,000. There are national sections in 27 countries, and corresponding groups and individual members in 21 other countries.

Elihu Burritt*

Marion Tilden Burritt
548 Riverside Drive
New York City

My dear Friend:

I am led to write you about your distinguished relation of a century ago—Elihu Burritt.

I was "brought up on" him in my Western Reserve home, at Seville, Ohio. When my ambition lagged in the Academy school, my father, Lyman Whitney Strong, used to whip it up by referring to "Elihu Burritt, the learned blacksmith." "Why," said father, "he worked at the forge and studied as he worked. He knew 55 languages."

In the last decade, as I have been called to enjoy "excavations" in finding democratic birthplaces in the Connecticut Valley, also searching for those who have wrought for Peace, the figure of Elihu Burritt has risen in many places. I found that he was one of the leading pioneers in the anti-slavery movement and in the fight for Peace. I discovered that he spent years in England and Europe, in organizing Peace Congresses, and in establishing news agencies and organs, with thousands of subscribers. I was astonished at the extent of his work in our land and in Europe as well. In all his work he was characteristically American. He agitated successfully for cheap ocean postage, especially as a Peace measure—the cost then being 25 cents each letter. Men like Victor Hugo co-operated with him in his work for peace.

An autobiography of him was published—but this was years ago. It ought to be republished and edited down to date. I know of no one as competent to do this as yourself. Of course, the former one is out of print. I hope you will be called upon to carry it through. I'll take 10 copies!—if not too high! I think it would have a fine reception. In someway, the life of Elihu Burritt should be brought back "to life" as an inspiration for modern Americans—especially for the Youth. In my opinion, he stands right along side Garrison, Sumner and Harriet Beecher Stowe.

In addition, let me say that there ought to be some suitable memorial for him in a place where we are wont to do honor to our great sons and daughters. If the Nobel organization ever gets to operating retroactively, so as to create "saints of Peace" I should like to nominate Elihu Burritt as among the first to be crowned.

I know that in suggesting an autobiography I have passed on to you a "hard job"—but you are most competent to do it. And, in a work like this, there is a very compelling call, to "do it now!" Further, the

publication of even a brief autobiography could but lead to the recognitions which I have indicated belong to him. It would not surprise me to see springing up Elihu Burritt Clubs."

Sincerely and cordially,
SYDNEY STRONG.
New York City.

*This letter to Miss Burritt, by our beloved Sydney Strong, will be of interest to all friends of Peace.—Editor.

Mencken's Mercury

Just a few years ago the magazine American Mercury had a circulation of 75,000. Young people packed it round under their arms, read it, enjoyed its literary quips and pranks, smiled at its wit, reveled in its satire, and caught seriously the sneers that it threw at serious things, especially religion. H. L. Mencken was its editor. Mr. Mencken is brilliant. He has a facile pen. He has richness and variety in satirical expression. He can make a chautauqua or a Rotary Club or a church look like a last year's bird's nest. His power of depreciation is marvelous. He would not be satisfied to leave any political or social or churchly institution to which he took a dislike looking "like thirty cents"; he would demolish it; he would leave it in ruins; he would "fiddle" while he burned it and gloat in its ashes. Carlyle would say of Mr. Mencken, "He had a torch to burn but no hammer to build." He began his editorial career by announcing that he "was living in sin; that he hated the twelve apostles; and that he expected to go to hell." He was the brilliant bad boy of the editorial world.

Now what of the American Mercury? Its circulation fell from 75,000 to 31,000. Its advertising fell proportionately. Everything about it dwindled. The flame of satire burned out, and Mr. Mencken sold out. The new owners propose to take the funereal remains to New York and make of it a kind of Metropolitan Colliers.

Per contra. The Christian Herald, founded nearly two generations ago by Dr. T. DeWitt Talmadge, standing for Evangelical Christianity, World Peace, Church Unity and Prohibition, lives and grows. A quarter of a million of people read it month by month.
—W. J. Lhamon, in the *Christian Community*.

THE ARBITRATOR

For sixteen years this petite peppery paper has offended some of its readers each month by its truthful exposition of the news. It has no axe to grind; it is not dull. It is for the under-dog and snappy.

The editor has written "The Mistakes of Jesus" to demonstrate the improvement in ethical, social and religious standards since the first century. Price $1, to include a year's subscription to The Arbitrator which is 60 cents.

114 East 31st St., New York City

Prayer from a Texas Hilltop*

Make me clean as Texas;
Wash my soul with space;
Purge my dreams with distance;
Turn aside Your face.

Here with treasure buried,
Bareness brought to view,
Help me learn to cherish
Even the search for You.

You have been too generous,
You who are everywhere,
Help me learn to seek You
That I may learn to share.

Make my heart, like Texas,
Offer home for all—
Death, the only boundary;
Love, the answered call.

RALPH CHEYNEY.
(Dedicated to Aline B. Carter)

*The above is here reprinted in full from issue of March 18, in view of the unfortunate omission of a whole line.

STARTLING FACTS
SUPPRESSED BY OTHER PAPERS ARE BEING EXPOSED NOW IN
LA FOLLETTE'S
GREAT NATIONAL WEEKLY NEWSPAPER
Regular Price $1.50 per year
The Progressive
Get the true facts from an authority.
Special Offer 3 Months (13 Issues) 20c
Send 20c Today for Next 13 Sensational Issues
THE PROGRESSIVE, DEPT. 44, MADISON, WISCONSIN

The April-May Issue of

The New Humanist

contains

MAX C. OTTO
"John Dewey's 'Common Faith'"

UNEMPLOYABILITY—A MEDICAL PROBLEM
Bernard Fantus

INTELLECTUALS UNDER FASCISM
C. Drevet

REGIMENTATION AND LIBERTY IN AMERICA
Robert Weston

ERASMUS INTERROGATES FATHER COUGHLIN
Harold P. Marley

SPRING NOCTURNE—A POEM
Mildred Hardcrest

HEBREW HISTORY SECULARIZED
F. H. Hankins

ARE WE SPIRITUALLY BANKRUPT?
Max Kaufman

THE GROUNDS OF GOOD GOVERNMENT
L. M. Pape

Free with each new subscription, any *one* of the following books, postpaid: HUMANIST SERMONS, edited by C. W. Reese; HUMANISM AND NEW WORLD IDEALS by Oliver L. Reiser; HUMANISM IN RELIGION EXAMINED by Robert J. Hutcheon; HUMANIST RELIGION by C. W. Reese.

Yearly $1.50 *Per Copy* 25c
Canadian & Foreign $1.75

Raymond B. Bragg, Editor
Edwin H. Wilson, Managing Editor

Published six times a year by
THE HUMANIST PRESS ASSOCIATION
330 South Dearborn Street, Chicago

Unity-Forward March

Special offer now running of $2.00 a year to new and old subscribers will expire July 1st next.

To be found in coming issues:

Articles by Rabbi Louis L. Mann, Brent Dow Allinson, James H. Cousins of India, Stephen S. Wise, Robert Whitaker, Dorothy Walton Binder and other equally outstanding writers. Also editorial comment on world affairs and reviews of outstanding books by competent critics.

UNITY is an excellent gift for friends, students, libraries, etc.

To Unity Publishing Company, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Gentlemen: Enclosed you will find check for $2.00 for which please enter / renew / extend my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Name .....

Address .....